

## KALAKAUA.

King of the beautiful Isles of the sea.  
Kalakaua!  
Republicans, Democrats, Greenbacks are we,  
Kalakaua!  
But all of us kogs to our welcome of thine,  
Kalakaua!  
Weeome him, Field, in a speech that's true;  
Weeome him, millions! him, and boat;  
Seater the greenbacks under his feet.  
Aftermer, come from the Tammany bowers,  
Sip up the toddy, and the wine that are ours;  
Piss him in state by the side of the mayor,  
Set up the wine and cigars, by the powers,  
Kalakaua!

## WAIFS.

—Milwaukee clergymen asks: "Is it proper to call to sound the 'r' in the word  
'Washington'?"

Fruit is gold in the morning, silver  
at noon, and lead at night. Look at Adam, who  
got into trouble by eating an apple after Eve.

"Home-Born Slaves" will be the  
topic of the discourse at the Congregational church  
Sunday evening. You are cordially invited.—  
*Dayton Times.*

A plumbing plumber stole \$700 from  
a house, while working there the other day.  
It was a strong set of luck for the house-owner,  
as the plumber didn't dare to come back for his pay.

The dispatches say that the lieutenant-governor of Connecticut, riding along, was  
as and when he may have been first in, but  
nobody ever misses a lieutenant-governor.

The temperature petition six hundred  
feet above the level of the sea. The tempera-  
ture was a rather insignificant affair when com-  
pared with the saloon "states" of the members.

—Notes from a dragoon's order book—  
"Carleton said," "super-exp." "perord hard  
and alias" ("Peruvian bark and sloes"); "one ounce  
of gross of supplement"; "porous plaster";  
"obedient" ("read yesterday"); "cough for a  
baby"; "keyan pepper, cam fire, loz, non, rieu  
but, pepper mint". —*House Sent.*

## THE LONG AND SHORT OF IT.

To the Editor of This Republican:  
The synopsis of the law bearing upon  
Guiteau's case, published recently in the *Critic*, if  
correctly stated, is remarkable for the evident  
misconception of law into which the writer appears to  
have fallen. Mr. Robinson's view of the matter  
might be correct were the crime with which Guiteau  
is charged to be charged one against the United  
States, but it does not appear to be so. The judicial  
system of the District of Columbia is of  
a nature to suppose the jurisdiction of a criminal court having  
knowledge of all manner of offense against  
the United States, excepting murder, and it also,  
by virtue of the Federal Statute, extends  
itself in cases arising under the laws of the United  
States, the jurisdiction of a Federal Circuit Court.  
All cases of homicide committed within the District  
of Columbia have been tried, technically speaking in  
the Federal Courts, and the Circuit Court sitting at a Circuit Court of the United States,

THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES.  
Crime is not a federal offense, but is controlled by  
statute. By few they are given cognizance of the  
crime of murder when committed upon the high  
seas or in "any fort, arsenal, dock-yard, magazine,  
or other place where arms, ammunition, or other  
military stores are kept, stored, or used, or in  
any place where the exclusive jurisdiction is  
of the United States," this last clause being intended to include the Indian  
country, and the like. —  
President Garfield was not murdered in any one of  
the places indicated within the intent and  
scope of the statute, but in the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

See Const. U. S., Art. I, Sec. 8, Section 781 of  
the Statutes referred to in the *Critic's* synopsis.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States had exclusive jurisdiction therein  
within the legal meaning of the term.

On the contrary, the only power claimed and re-  
served to Congress is that of exclusive legislation  
in respect to the District of Columbia, and no  
dictation.

Under the circumstances, the jurisdiction of  
the District of Columbia, it is true, but there is nothing  
in the statute to show that the  
United States